

Message

**From:** LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]  
**Sent:** 12/27/2017 12:44:27 AM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** No Action needed - FYI - Revised cover ltr + narrative comments + responses to your notes  
**Attachments:** EPA comments on draft Rad Data Eval Parcels B G Cover 12-25-2017.doc; EPA comments on draft Rad Data Eval Parcel B G - Narrative.docx

Dear John,

I'm sorry that I've been all over the place on the numbers. I was trying to do bottom up counting, but I didn't understand what Nina had done. So I now gave up on that, and I'm doing top down instead. Which gets up back to close to – but not exactly - the version before.

So I can take the 2<sup>nd</sup> page you gave me and put it together with the revised 1<sup>st</sup> page. You don't have to do anything else.

Re your notes on the draft narratives, I took care of all those fixes. I had meant to do these later, but thanks for making sure I didn't forget any of them.

From John, my responses in red:

Here's some very minor things just so you make sure to see them:

Remove "Draft" watermark on both sets of documents. done

Parcel B additional comments:

In the heading, note that you call them Version 6. Is that necessary? Removed

In first lead-in paragraph: Not sure we need to call the Parcel G comments "interim draft". Removed

Don't forget to delete Comment 25 that is stricken Removed

Parcel G comments:

In title: Delete "Interim Draft" and "Version 3"? Removed

Delete "Draft" in footnote? Removed

Comment 18, second to last Paragraph. Do you still want to say "all fill units require sampling"? – Yes, because it turns out that all the fill units had received soil from one of the suspect trench units

Comment 20. Check 94% figure – Yes, 94% of trench units, 100% of fill, 94% of bldg. site units ended up total overall 97%

I have a few more fixes to the spreadsheets to clean up language (probably will do tonight), but I wanted to at least get the text to you in case you had any more comments before I send final. If I don't hear from you, I will go ahead, since I responded to all your comments already in the versions attached.

**EPA, CDPH, and DTSC review of Parcel B Rad Data Evaluation 12-23-2017**

	Trench	Fill	Building Sites	Total	% of total
<b>Tota Survey Units in Parcel B</b>	70	110	17	197	100%
<b>Navy recommended resampling</b>	2	18	9	29	15%

<b>Navy recommended reanalyzing archived samples</b>	2	1	0	3	2%
<b>EPA, CDPH, DTSC recommend resampling</b>	55	87	7	149	76%
<b>Total recommended resampling</b>	57	105	16	178	90%
<b>No signs of falsification found in data</b>	13	5	1	19	10%
<b>Regulators not yet reviewed</b>	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>% of total recommended resampling</b>	81%	95%	94%	90%	

The above was for Parcel B alone. Below is for entire Shipyard.

<b>Total Survey Units in Hunters Pt Tetra Tech EC</b>	305	514	*
<b>Parcel B as % of total</b>	23%	21%	*

\* Parcel B has 7 former building sites, which is 21% of the total 34. The above chart shows survey units at building sites.

The number of survey units at building sites for the entire site was not available.